PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter II of the Patent Conserving Treaty) | RECT | 1 8 MAR 2006

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

アルカ	U	U	1,11,11,	
				PCT
NIPO)			

Appli 303	cant's or agent's file reference 16	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Form PCT/IPEA/416				
International application No. PCT/CA2004/000898		International filing date (day/month/yell 18.06.2004	ar) Priority date (day/month/year) 18.06.2003				
	national Patent Classification (IPC) o SF3/00	r national classification and IPC					
Appli ZI C	icant CORPORATION et al.						
1.	This report is the international Authority under Article 35 and	preliminary examination report, establi transmitted to the applicant according	shed by this International Preliminary Examining to Article 36.				
2.	This REPORT consists of a tot	Consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.					
3.	This report is also accompanie	his report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, comprising:					
	a. Sent to the applicant and to the International Bureau) a total of sheets, as follows:						
sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).							
	sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.						
i	sequence listing and/or	al Bureau only) a total of (indicate type tables related thereto, in computer rea nce Listing (see Section 802 of the Adı	and number of electronic carrier(s)) , containing a adable form only, as indicated in the Supplemental ministrative Instructions).				
4.	This report contains indication	s relating to the following items:					
	☑ Box No. I Basis of the	opinion					
	☐ Box No. II Priority	•					
į	☐ Box No. III Non-establis	hment of opinion with regard to novelt	ty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
	☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity	of Invention					
	applicability	citations and explanations supporting	rd to novelty, inventive step or industrial such statement				
		uments cited					
		cts in the international application					
	⊠ Box No. VIII Certain obs	ervations on the international application	on				
Date	e of submission of the demand	Date of co	mpletion of this report				
18.	01.2005	06.03.20	006				
	ne and mailing address of the intern	ational Authorized	Officers Piles.				
prel	iminary examining authority: European Patent Office - D-10958 Berlin Tel. +49 30 25901 - 0 Fax: +49 30 25901 - 840	Kirsten,	K e No. +49 30 25901-				

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/CA2004/000898

	Box No. I Basis of the report					
1.	With regard to the language , this filed, unless otherwise indicated	egard to the language , this report is based on the international application in the language in which it was nless otherwise indicated under this item.				
	☐ This report is based on trans which is the language of a tr	slations from the original language into the following language , anslation furnished for the purposes of:				
	☐ international search (und☐ publication of the internat☐ international preliminary	er Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)) tional application (under Rule 12.4) examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)				
2.	2. With regard to the elements* of the international application, this report is based on (replacement sheet have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report):					
	Description, Pages					
	1-15	as originally filed				
	Claims, Numbers					
	1-28	as originally filed				
	Drawings, Sheets					
	1/3-3/3	as originally filed				
	☐ a sequence listing and/or ar	ny related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing				
3.	The amendments have result the description, pages the claims, Nos. ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs the sequence listing (specific any table(s) related to see	s ecify):				
4.	had not been made, since they Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)) the description, pages the claims, Nos. the drawings, sheets/figsthe the sequence listing (sp) any table(s) related to s	s <i>necify)</i> : equence listing <i>(specify)</i> :				
	* If item 4 applies s	ome or all of these sheets may be marked "superseded."				

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-28

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-28

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims No: Claims 1-28

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7):

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- 1. Reference is made to the following document: D1: WO 01/45034
- 2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 2.1 Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):
 A text entry system (10) with:

a display (13) visually divided into two functional areas (see e.g. figure 9; page 11, paragraph 3 and page 12, line 7-15), a first of the functional areas corresponding to a first aspect of entering text, and a second of the functional areas corresponding to a second aspect of entering text;

an indicator (12) system operable by one human digit, the indicator system having at least a first cardinal state, a second cardinal state and a third cardinal state, the third cardinal state having no textual meaning with it; (see e.g. figures 1,2,5, for indicator states; the system described in D1 has e.g. selection options, which is not directly "textual")

a processor (11) responsive to each cardinal state, whereby the indicator system may be used to select options displayed in at least one of the functional areas;

a program (see e.g. figure 3) controlling the processor so that text may be entered in response to a user selecting at least one of the options.

- 3. Independent claims 15,22 correspond to independent claim 1, and same reasoning regarding novelty can be applied. Thus, the subject-matter of claims 25,22 is not novel. (Article 33(2) PCT).
- 4. The dependent claims 2-14,16-21,23-28 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements

of the PCT in respect of novelty and inventive step because the subject-matter of these claims are disclosed in D1. (Article 33(2) PCT).

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

- 1. Although claims 15,22 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought and/or in respect of the terminology used for the features of that subject-matter. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness. Moreover, lack of clarity of the claims as a whole arises, since the plurality of independent claims makes it difficult, if not impossible, to determine the matter for which protection is sought, and places an undue burden on others seeking to establish the extent of the protection. Hence, the above mentioned claims do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.
- 2. The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because claims 1,15,22 and the dependent claims are not clear. The expressions "cardinal states" (claim 1,15,22) and "textual meaning" (claim 1) are unclear. The expression "cardinal state" is used in the claims (including the dependent claims) in connection with "functional areas", "categories", "options", "aspect", "mode", "meaning", "position" without providing any explanation what these terms mean. Even after reading the description, it remains confusing what could be meant in the claims. It has to be possible to understand the claims by reading the claims alone. What is and what is not a "textual meaning" is also not clear.
